1. Jurisdiction and Service

The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over plaintiff's claims. Jurisdiction is based on 29 U.S.C. Section 1132(e) because plaintiff seeks benefits under an employee welfare benefit plan governed by the provisions of ERISA. All the parties are subject to the Court's jurisdiction. No parties remain to be served.

2. Facts

Plaintiff Christine Clecak seeks disability benefits under an employee welfare benefit plan governed by the provisions of ERISA. Plaintiff is 40 years old, and was employed by Apple Computer, Inc. as an administrative assistant when she went out on disability in or about September of 2005. Plaintiff has been diagnosed with lumbar spinal stenosis, as well as other medical conditions, and complains of lower back pain.

Based on her employment at Apple Computer, Inc., plaintiff was a participant in defendant Apple Computer, Inc.'s Short and Long Term Disability Plan which provided disability insurance coverage to eligible employees of Apple Computer, Inc., including plaintiff. This disability insurance was provided pursuant to a group policy of insurance issued by Life Insurance Company of North America (hereinafter "LINA"). Plaintiff submitted a claim for long term disability benefits in or about August of 2006. LINA initially approved plaintiff's claim for long term disability benefits, and paid long term disability benefits to plaintiff between September 22, 2006 and July 21, 2007. LINA determined that plaintiff was not entitled to long term disability benefits after July 21, 2007.

The principal factual issue in dispute is whether plaintiff is entitled to the long term disability benefits which she seeks under the defendant Plan and/or the subject group policy issued by LINA, and specifically whether she is entitled to disability benefits from on or about July 22, 2007 through the present.

3. Legal Issues

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

The following legal issues will be presented:

- a. Whether the appropriate standard of review of the claim decision is de novo or abuse of discretion.
- b. Whether the claim decision (to deny plaintiff's claim for disability benefits after July 21, 2007) was proper under the applicable standard of review.

4. Motions

The parties expect to file cross-motions for judgment pursuant to Fed. Rule of Civil Procedure 52 or cross-motions for summary judgment pursuant to Fed. Rule of Civil Procedure 56.

5. Amendment of Pleadings

The parties currently do not anticipate any amendments to their pleadings.

6. Evidence Preservation

LINA has maintained an administrative record relating to plaintiff's claim for disability benefits under the defendant Plan and/or the subject group insurance policy. This administrative record will be produced to plaintiff as part of defendant's Initial Disclosure. There are no ongoing activities related to plaintiff's claim, nor ongoing communications with plaintiff. Therefore, no steps are necessary to preserve relevant evidence.

7. Disclosures

The parties agree to serve their Initial Disclosures on or before July 24, 2008.

8. Discovery

No discovery has been served to date.

2728

Plaintiff contends that discovery might be necessary to determine the nature and extent of any possible conflict of interest.

Defendant contends that discovery is improper in this action which is based on the provisions of ERISA. The admissible evidence should be limited to the administrative record maintained by LINA, the subject group insurance policy, and the plan documents.

6

7

8

1

2

3

4

5

9. Class Actions

Not applicable.

9

10

11

12

10. Related Cases

The parties are not aware of any related cases or proceedings pending before another judge of this court, or before another court or administrative body.

13

14

15

16

17

11. Relief

Plaintiff's Complaint seeks an order that defendant pay plaintiff the disability benefits due plus interest, and that plaintiff is entitled to an award for her attorney fees and costs.

Defendant also seeks an attorney fee award in this action.

18

19

20

21

12. Settlement and ADR

No settlement discussions have taken place to date. The parties have agreed to the following ADR process: Mediation pursuant to ADR L.R. 6.

22

23

24

13. Consent to Magistrate Judge For All Purposes

The parties consent to Magistrate Judge Wayne D. Brazil for all purposes.

25

26

27

28

360332.1

	Case 4	::08-cv-01987-WDB Document 12 Filed 07/14/2008 Page 5 of 7
1	14.	Other References
2		This case is not suitable for reference to binding arbitration, a special master, or the Judicial
3	Panel on Multidistrict Litigation.	
4		
5	15.	Narrowing of Issues
6		The parties may agree and stipulate as to the standard of review to be utilized by the Court.
7		The parties currently do not anticipate any request to bifurcate issues, claims, or defenses.
8		
9	16.	Expedited Schedule
10		It is likely that this is the type of case that can be handled with streamlined procedures,
11	such as cross-motions for summary judgment. The parties recommend that the ADR process be	
12	compl	eted before the date for filing dispositive motions.
13		
14	17.	Scheduling
15		The parties propose the following dates for the dispositive motions:
16		Cross-Motions for Judgment to be filed on: October 31, 2008
17		Oppositions to be filed on: Per Local Rules
18		Reply Briefs to be filed on: Per Local Rules
19		Hearing Date: December 10, 2008
20		
21	18.	<u>Trial</u>
22		The parties agree that this case is subject to a court trial, and that there is no right to a jury
23	trial for ERISA claims.	
24		In the event that this matter is not resolved by the dispositive motions, the parties estimate

that a bench trial will last 1 to 4 hours.

28

27

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Christine Clecak v. Apple Computer, Inc.'s Short and Long Term Disability Plan, et al. USDC NDCA Case #CV08-01987 WDB

I am a citizen of the United States. I am over the age of eighteen years and am not a party to the within cause. I am employed in the City and County of San Francisco, California and my business address is 525 California Street, 17th Floor, San Francisco, California 94105.

On this date I served the following document(s):

JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

on the parties identified below, through their attorneys of record, by placing true copies thereof in sealed envelopes addressed as shown below by the following means of service:

X: By First Class Mail -- I caused each such envelope, with first class postage thereon fully prepaid, to be deposited in a recognized place of deposit of the U.S. Mail in San Francisco, California, for collection to the office of the addressee following ordinary business practices.

☐ : By Personal Service – I caused each such envelope to be given to a courier messenger who personally delivered each such envelope to the office of the address.

☐ : By Overnight Courier – I caused each such envelope to be given to an overnight mail service at San Francisco, California, to be hand delivered to the office of the addressee on the next business day.

☐ : Facsimile – (Only where permitted. Must consult CCP § 1012.5 and California Rules of Court 2001-2011. Also consult FRCP Rule 5(e). Not currently authorized in N.D.C.A.)

Timothy J. Fricker, Esq. James G. Mellen, Esq.

Karen L. Creech, Esq.

FRICKER & MELLÊN & ASSOCIATES 17

Tribune Tower 409 13th Street, 17th Floor

Oakland, CA 94612

(510) 663-8484 Tel:

> (510) 663-0639 Fax:

Attorneys for Plaintiff CHRISTINE CLECAK

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

EXECUTED July 14, 2008 at San Francisco, California.

JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

USDC NDCA Case #CV08-01987 WDB 360332.1

4 5

6

1

2

3

7

8 9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27